

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/452,844	1	2/03/1999	IVO RAAIJMAKERS	ASMEX.256A	ASMEX.256A 1825	
20995	7590	01/24/2002				
		S OLSON & BE	EXAMINER			
620 NEWPO SIXTEENT	H FLOOR			ROCCHEGIANI, RENZO		
NEWPORT	BEACH, C	CA 92660		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2825		
				DATE MAILED: 01/24/2002	•	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/452,844	RAAIJMAKERS ET	AL.				
,	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Renzo N. Rocchegiani	2825					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.) a timely filed amendment wh al (with appeal fee); or (3) a tim	ication. A proper repict places	cation in				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing dots. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 1706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dat have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the set forth in the set forth in the set forth in the set for the set	of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. S 136(a) and the appropriate e fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		•				
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or s	simplifying the				
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely filed	d amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NC	T place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an				
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-35, 55-66</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a)∏ approved or b)∏ disap	proved by the Exam	iner.				
$9. \boxtimes$ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen							
10. Other:	SUPEF	MATTHEW SMITH RVISGRY PATENT EXAMIN HNOLOGY CENTER 280					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments did not persuade the examiner. Applicant's main argument is that there is no motivation to combine the references. Examiner disagrees with applicant and thinks that it would be obvious to combine the references since the ALD deposition is well known in the art. Furthermore, as for depositing a high dielectric layer over the HSG, the examiner reiterates that this limitation is disclosed by the main reference and thus it is anticipated and not obvious and there needs to be no motivation shown for this step. The fact that other documents do not teach or disclose this step is immaterial, the fact that it is disclosed in one patent is already proof that the step is not novel. Therefore, the rejection stands.